

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The specification is amended by the present response to more properly place the headings.

Claims 1-5 and 10-23 are pending in this application. Claims 6-9 and 24-38 are canceled by the present response without prejudice.

Claims 5 and 13-23 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). That objection is traversed by the present response as the new claims do not recite any improper multiple dependencies.

The claims are also amended to avoid the language objected to in claims 4 and 10.

Claims 1, 3, 43/1, and 4/3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by JP 55-86371. Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by JP 11-195852 to Sakurai et al. (herein “Sakurai”). Claims 2 and 4/2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over JP 55-86371. Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sakurai in view of U.S. patent 6,710,682 to Onishi et al. (herein “Onishi”). Claims 9/6 and 9/7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sakurai in view of U.S. patent 6,781,483 to Tanaka et al. (herein “Tanaka”). Claim 9/8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sakurai in view of Onishi as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Tanaka. Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over GB 2 268 000 to Sone et al. (herein “Sone”) in view of Sakurai. Claims 12/10 and 12/11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sone in view of Sakurai as applied to claims 10 and 11, and further in view of U.S. patent 5,162,822 to Wakamori.

Addressing the above-noted rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

The above-noted rejections appear divided into three groups with different primary references, one set of rejections relying on JP 55-86371 as the primary rejection, other rejections relying on Sakurai as the primary reference, and other rejections relying on Sone as the primary reference. Applicants respectfully submit the claims as written distinguish over each of the previous rejections.

Independent claim 1 is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein by now reciting “an input side connection terminal electrode that is connected to an input terminal of the filter and an output side connection terminal that is connected to an output terminal of the filter, in a fitting region for said filter”. That subject matter is clear from the original specification for example at page 37, lines 5-9. Independent claim 1 now also additionally recites:

a wiring connected to said input side connection terminal electrode, and a wiring connected to said output side connection terminal electrode, each of said wirings extending in a direction that is orthogonal to a transmission direction of an input signal within said filter up to an elbow position at least equal to or less than 10 mm from said fitting region, and extending in a direction parallel to the transmission direction of the input signal within said filter from said elbow position.

That subject matter is evident for example from original Claim 7. Other of the claims are amended to clarify language therein and to address objections in the Office Action. No new matter is believed to be added. The features recited in the claims as written are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

According to the claims as written, a printed substrate includes a feature of:

a wiring connected to said input side connection terminal electrode, and a wiring connected to said output side connection terminal electrode, each of said wirings extending in a direction that is orthogonal to a transmission direction of an input signal within said filter up to an elbow position at

equal to or less than 10 mm from said fitting region, and extending in a direction parallel to the transmission direction of the input signal within said filter from said elbow position.

By utilizing such a structure, the claimed invention enables advantageous results such as being able to suppress undesirable propagation of an input signal input from the input side terminal electrode directly to the output side terminal electrode, and making it possible to establish reliable propagation within the filter. Due to that, it becomes possible to prevent deterioration of attenuation characteristics of the filter with respect to the input signal input from the input side terminal electrode.¹

As a further advantage in the claimed invention, by setting the elbow position to within 10 mm, which is the predetermined distance from the fitting region of the filter, it becomes possible to obtain desired attenuation characteristics for the input signal.²

Thereby, with the claimed invention a printed substrate capable of preventing undesirable deterioration of attenuation characteristics of a filter can be realized.

Applicants respectfully submit none of the cited art discloses or suggests the above-noted wirings, and thus the claims as written distinguish over the applied art.

In view of the present response applicants respectfully submit the claims as written are allowable over the cited art.

¹ See the present specification at page 11, lines 8-13.

² See the present specification at page 11, lines 9-21.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)
SNS/rac

I:\ATTY\SNS\25s\256082\256082US-AM.DOC